



George Weber  
<gw@gwenvironmental.com>

04/24/2005 09:06 PM

Margaret Schonbeck <margaret.schonbeck@state.co.us>, Amy Jones <amy3995@yahoo.com>, Raquel Holguin <rholguin8@yahoo.com>, Chris Poulet/RA/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, James Chapman <james.chapman@ci.denver.co.us>, Jane Mitchell <jane.mitchell@state.co.us>, Kenneth Cotton/ENF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Jessica Sewell <jessica.sewell@mail.house.gov>, anthomas@juno.com, "Arend, Chris" <Chris.Arend@mail.house.gov>, "Barbara O'Grady" <barbara.ograde@state.co.us>, Celia Vanderloop <Celia.Vanderloop@ci.denver.co.us>, Patricia Courtney/OCF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Derek Boer <derek.boer@state.co.us>, DouglasKay@aol.com, Gene Hook <gene.hook@ci.denver.co.us>, George Weber <gw@gwenvironmental.com>, Gloria Shearer % Steve Reemts <stmartinplaza@qwest.net>, "Hoff, Martha F - To Environmental Health" <Martha.Hoff@ci.denver.co.us>, Jennifer Chergo/OCF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Jim and Karen Halberg Weaver <halbergweaver@members.mkl-mmef.org>, Karen Kellen/ENF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Victor Ketellapper/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Little, Bob" <BLittle@ASARCO.com>, Lorraine Granado <lorrygranado@yahoo.com>, lumumbaphd@yahoo.com, Michael Kosnett <Michael.Kosnett@uchsc.edu>, Michelle Smith <msmith@projectresourcesinc.com>, Wendy OBrien/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Richard Lotz <richard.lotz@state.co.us>, "Salas, Jason S - Environmental Health" <Jason.Salas@ci.denver.co.us>, "Tafoya-Dominguez, Beverly - Environmental Health" <Beverly.Tafoya-Dominguez@ci.denver.co.us>, Dawn Tesorero/ENF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Glenn Tucker <gjt1@cdc.gov>, Wendy Hawthorne <whawthorne@nedenverhousing.org>

cc

bcc

Subject VB-I70 Working Group 3-31-05 Meeting FINAL Notes

Folks --

I didn't receive any additions or corrections, so I've 'finalized' these meeting notes.

Thanks

George Weber, Inc.  
Environmental Policy Analysis, Planning, & Management  
303/494-8572  
[gw@gwenvironmental.com](mailto:gw@gwenvironmental.com)



[www.gwenvironmental.com](http://www.gwenvironmental.com) FINAL Vasquez I-70 W/king Grp 3-31-05 Meeting Notes 1.pdf

**DRAFT (4-24-05)**  
**Vasquez I-70 Working Group**  
**Meeting Notes**

**March 31, 2005**  
**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**  
**Swansea Recreation Center**  
**2650 East 49th Avenue**  
**Denver, CO 80216**

**ATTENDING**

**Meeting Participants:** Please see attachment.

**Facilitator:** George Weber, George Weber Inc. Environmental

**Recorder:** Jennifer Chergo, Region VIII EPA, Community Relations

**BACKGROUND AND MEETING OBJECTIVES**

Meeting called by: Vasquez I-70 Working Group

Type of meeting: Reporting, Q&A, feedback, discussion, planning, decision-making – depending on the issue.

Distributed for participants to read prior to meeting: Outline of CHP up-date.

**Desired Outcomes:**

- Participants receive a progress report and provide feedback in re soil clean-up, EPA-CDPHE managers' response to community's letter in re how residences will be qualified for external lead based paint abatement under Superfund, Kids at Play Health Survey, and CHP.
- Partners cooperating in Program reaffirm commitment to community representation & involvement as general guiding principle in carrying out remaining work of all Program components, specific actions achieving this positively and pragmatically are identified, actions on which affected partners can agree identified, and next steps on how to address actions on which affected partners cannot agree identified & next steps to resolve these explored.

The meeting notes below primarily reflect the notes Jennifer Chergo wrote on the easel paper during the meeting, supplemented by brief notes she and George Weber took in our notebooks during the meeting.

## **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

George Weber began by:

- Asking each meeting participant to introduce themselves to the group.
- Asking if everyone had received notes for the 1-27-05 Working Group meeting and if anyone had questions.
- Suggesting that for today's agenda, he would like to try doing a 'closure' at the end of discussion of each agenda topic, rather than waiting to try doing a closure addressing all at the end of the meeting. The reason he gave was that at the last meeting by the time the group got to the 'closure', participants had already been leaving.
- Explained that Jennifer Chergo, Region VIII Community Relations, had agreed to take meeting notes on easel paper that would be posted in front of the group. He explained that the technique was intended to help the meeting progress more efficiently, give opportunity to participants for ensuring that their contributions were recognized and described accurately, help latecomers catch-up quickly, and capture participants' decisions, particularly regarding subsequent actions.
- Indicated that he had a strategy for addressing the more than two dozen specific 'action items' suggested by community and agency representatives for potentially improving community representation and involvement in the remaining Program implementation.

## **2. SOILS CLEAN-UP: PROGRESS REPORT AND Q&A**

Victor Ketellapper, Site Program Manager, Region VIII EPA said that the soil clean-up has been moving along. Asarco has begun cleaning up the 100 properties it is obligated to clean-up under the Consent Decree. EPA is overseeing the work. Bob Litle, Asarco, noted that they've completed work on two properties.

Victor talked about getting access to the residential properties that have not been sampled yet. He said that EPA is sending out a certified letter to landlords. EPA is sending out yet another letter by regular mail to others who thus far have denied access. EPA will be contacting community groups to help with these property owners.

## **3. EXTERIOR LEAD BASED PAINT ABATEMENT: PROGRESS REPORT AND Q&A**

Victor Ketellapper, Site Program Manager, Region VIII EPA noted that he had received letters on the issue from both CEASE and the City of Denver. Hopefully, he said, he'll have more in the way of a response by the next meeting. In the meantime, he's looking at one site that's doing a similar cleanup in Omaha, Nebraska. Also, in the meantime, Northeast Denver Housing is evaluating homes and we can use this data however we decide which homes to perform abatements. EPA is looking into using local resources to do the abatement work.

At the end of the discussion, George asked participants to help him identify 'action items' and Jennifer to note these on the board. The 'action items' identified and additional questions and comments follow:

- EPA is evaluating how to get local contractors training and certification to do the work during April. James Chapman suggested that we form a committee in re certification.
- EPA will conduct a pre-bid conference for interested contractors within 2-3 months, i.e., May or June. Victor asked the community representatives to identify interested contractors and to identify these to PRI.
- EPA – will issue a 'Request for Proposals' (RFP) soon for contractor(s) to conduct the assessment to determine eligibility for abatement. Wendy Hawthorne said that she doesn't think the proposed assessment method will identify many homes that would need abatement. Jim Weaver asked if CEASE can provide input to EPA HQ regarding the proposed lead-based paint assessment methodology? Victor said yes, and identified Mike Cook as the person whom CEASE should contact. Joan Hooker asked how to contact him. Anthony Thomas talked about the problem of lead based paint chips everywhere and asked if these would recontaminate the new soils? He asked if Regulation 19 was state or federal, and if this wasn't the regulation governing this situation. James suggested that it would be easier for the community if EPA made addressing lead based paint a pilot project, then go nationally.

#### **4. KIDS AT PLAY STUDY: PROGRESS REPORT AND Q&A**

Margaret Shonbeck said the final report will be produced approximately at the end of May. She will come back and report to the group at that time. She reminded the group that the study premise is looking at soil pica using arsenic and lead studies as biomarkers for that behavior.

Jim Weaver asked if and how the information was being used in the Community Health Program (CHP). He thought it would be an excellent study to help get people involved in the Program. He was concerned the study information was not being used in a meaningful way.

Margaret stated that there were confidentiality issues regarding specific results. She said that one recommendation from the study can be used by the CHP now – i.e., for people to continue bio-monitoring. She noted that kids who were found to have greater than 10 mg/dl of lead in their blood were followed, as was the threshold defined in the study. Those below 10 were hard to follow outside of the study because of confidentiality issues.

Jane Mitchell said that hopefully those kids under 10 will be found through the CHP and will be helped that way.

Jay Salas said that CHP workers ask if children have been tested before, and encourage

people to get children tested. CHP can provide a contact for the Kids At Play Study to their list of contact information.

Someone noted that of the 50 cases of children with elevated blood lead levels identified by the Kids at Play Study, only 22 were confirmed. Many were not followed for various reasons.

There was a general discussion then about combining the Kids at Play and the CHP. CHP workers can set up appointments with target families if necessary. CHP could attempt to make a follow-up contact with families where children had a result greater than 10 mg/dl.

At the end of the discussion, George asked participants to help him identify 'action items' and Jennifer to note these on the board. The 'action items' identified and additional questions and comments follow:

- CDPHE will produce the final report approximately at the end of May 2005.
- CDPHE will present results at outreach events, including meetings and community assistance events. Possibly, a newsletter could be sent to community members.
- CDPHE will ask ASTDR, Atlanta, if they can send families with children who were tested a letter reminding them that their children were tested.
- Margaret provided a contact for parents to call to find out results for their children, i.e., Dr. Jim Ruttenber, University of Colorado Health Sciences, 303-315-5627.

## **5. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT & PARTICIPATION IN CARRYING OUT THE REST OF THE PROGRAM (I.E., SOILS SAMPLING & CLEAN-UP, CHP)**

George suggested to the group that it try to address this issue following the process describe below, in order to have a chance to hear everyone's concerns and at working through the many specific positive suggestions he obtained from community leaders and agency staff during the previous week:

- What Are Community Concerns? Community members state their concerns about the quality of community representation and involvement in the Program currently.
- Are There Limits (e.g., legal, pragmatic, etc.) On Making the Principle Operational? Government Program Managers state describe their concerns and the legal, administrative, and pragmatic parameters within which they need to work.
- Break
- Topic Closure:

- Strive for a consensus agreement that all partners recommit to 'Community Representation & Involvement' as a general guiding principle in carrying out the rest of the Program.
- Ask participants for specific actions that can be taken that are positive and doable to achieve the principle of community representation and involvement? (e.g., move Steering Committee meeting site, Community Open House for CHP Workers, more ....).
- Ask if there are specific actions that the affected partners can agree to now?
- Ask for the other remaining specific actions – 'What Should We Do Next?' (e.g., negotiate, work out details, etc) , 'Who Needs to Do It?', and When?

Anthony Thomas began the discussion, stating that he and other citizens were feeling left out of the process. He asked that Steering Committee meetings be moved into the community from downtown, and that CHP worker meetings be moved from Curtis Park into the Vasquez Boulevard – I70 community. He wants to play a part in what CHP workers are doing, to see information given to homeowners about exterior paint issue, and consequences – fines – given to realtors for not disclosing lead contamination issues to potential buyers. The community at large should have more information from sources other than the CHP workers. He said he that community youth groups should be involved, and that resources should be leveraged to help with issues like lead abatement for the long term. He asked, "How do we create a long term plan for this program? How do we include Whittier and other nearby areas?" He expressed concern about tenants, i.e., transient residents, and wanted residents to be informed that hotspots may remain – he feared that they may have a false sense of security.

Anthony noted that he is speaking for himself only on all of the above. He then turned to other community members for their views on the community involvement issue.

Jim Weaver said that he agreed and that specifically the CHP is not filtering back as well as he would like.

James Chapman said that the community could be referred to Denver Environmental Health because there are things the community can't do.

Anthony seemed to disagree with this and reiterated that he thinks the folks who have been involved should be more involved.

James suggested involving new groups, and mentioned CNOWA specifically.

Anthony said that he hasn't heard of this group.

Jim said he is involved with this group.

Anthony noted that Clayton and Cole have youth groups who can do outreach in the summer but that they need to know what they need.

Jim stated his concern that the Program is now scheduled to end in September 2006 and the fact that the CHP really is just getting started, making for only an 18 month program.

Jay Salas brought up the sustainability question.

Akive Starnes expressed concern about people moving in and out, and wants a grant or loan so that owners can be approached.

Wendy Hawthorne noted that there are all these different community groups and leaders that are not that involved. She asked if it is possible to pay some of these to work? She suggested putting some of the leaders through the CHW training.

Gloria Schearer asked if we need more publicity regarding the CHWs.

Anthony again expressed his concern about hot spots left in yards.

Wendy suggested that the flier needs work regarding hotspots.

Victor Ketellapper agreed that people need to be aware that there might be hot spots.

George turned to Martha and asked her to tell the group about some of the parameters and constraints within which the CHP needed to work.

Martha Hoff talked about the difficulties Denver Environmental Health, and she and Jay Salas specifically, have faced in getting the CHP implemented. She noted that the CHP had to get through an enormous bureaucracy before the program could start. She noted that the document management process is laborious and that she, Jay, and the Community Health Workers (CHWs) are only part-time only. Many daily issues confronted the staff at the start of CHP worker canvassing that made it a slow start. Obtaining the field office was essential.

She said that the CHP worker dialogue and actions are based on a document developed by the community and that all materials must go through a review process. She said that the Working Group was not the forum for review and input of materials, but that a separate process and subgroup was needed, that the Program must keep moving along on a day-to-day basis. She said that this subgroup would need to meet once a week to review materials and make changes, and that she would need telephone numbers in order to be able to call the community representatives more frequently if she needed immediate feedback.

She did state that communication has been lacking and noted that they have solicited community help/input on certain issues. Bottom-line, she said that there are many opportunities for community leaders to get involved now.

The meeting had run well past noon, and participants had not begun to work through the specific suggestions systematically. The participants decided that the community representatives would meet with Martha and Jay, the next Thursday, 4/7/05, at the Swansea Recreation Center, from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. EPA and CDPHE Community Relations staff would attend. Victor appointed George to plan and facilitate this meeting.

(The discussion during the meeting, and between George and community leaders and agency staff during the preceding week, produced approximately three dozen specific suggestions of how to improve community representation and involvement in the remaining Program implementation. These are identified in an attachment accompanying these minutes. The reader is referred to notes of the 4/7/05 meeting, sent to all Working Group participants, prior to transmission of these notes of the 3/31/05 Working Group meeting.)

#### **6. COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAM – PROGRESS REPORT & Q&A (ISSUES NOT ADDRESSED ABOVE)**

The participants did not get to this agenda item before adjourning.

#### **7. CLOSURE -- NEXT STEPS – NEXT MEETING?**

George Weber asked the group if this meeting site and time was 'OK' with the group, and when the next meeting should occur.

Several members of the group indicated that the location and time were good.

The participants decided that the next meeting would be held at the same time and place on Thursday, May 19, 2005.

Participants then adjourned the meeting.